Case 1:18-mj-03161-KMW Document 66 Filed 05/29/18 Page 1 of 2



Boston Brussels Chicago Dallas Düsseldorf Frankfurt Houston London Los Angeles Miami Milan Munich New York Orange County Paris Seoul Silicon Valley Washington, D.C.

Strategic alliance with MWE China Law Offices (Shanghai)

Stephen M. Ryan Attorney at Law sryan@mwe.com +1 202 756 8333

May 28, 2018

VIA ECF

United States District Judge Kimba M. Wood United States District Court for the Southern District of New York United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street New York, New York 10007-1312

Re: Michael D. Cohen v. United States of America, 18-MJ-3161 (KMW)

Dear Judge Wood:

We represent plaintiff Michael D. Cohen ("Mr. Cohen") in the above-referenced matter. We write regarding Mr. Avenatti's letter and motion for admission *pro hac vice*. We submitted to the Court a letter on May 9 (ECF 41) and a memorandum of law on May 18 (ECF 53) opposing Mr. Avenatti's application for *pro hac vice* admission in this case. We have previously provided the Court with various reasons why *pro hac vice* admission is inappropriate for Mr. Avenatti given the circumstances of his conduct in this matter.

We write to bring to the Court's attention a recent decision by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California regarding conduct by Mr. Avenatti and his law firm, Eagan Avenatti LLP, which led the Bankruptcy Court to impose a \$10 Million judgment against Mr. Avenatti's law firm last week. See In re Eagan Avenatti, LLP, No. 8:17-bk-11961-CB (C.D. Cal. May 22, 2018), ECF 445. This judgment occurred after Mr. Cohen's pro hac vice response was filed with the Court. We attach the following: Exhibit A - the Bankruptcy Court's Order; Exhibit B - the Complaint from that proceeding; and Exhibit C - a May 25, 2018 New York Law Journal article regarding the conduct of Mr. Avenatti's law firm in relation to that proceeding. The Bankruptcy Court reviewed a record that included an arbitration panel order that found Mr. Avenatti's firm "acted with malice, oppression and fraud" See Exhibit B, Jason Frank Law, PLC v. Michael J. Avenatti, No. BC 706555, at Ex. 2 (Cal. Sup. Ct. May 16, 2018) (attaching as Exhibit 2, Jason Frank Law, PLC v. Eagan Avenatti, LLP, JAMS Ref. No. 1220053114 (2017) (Friedman, Arb.)). The Honorable Karen S. Jennemann, a Federal Bankruptcy Judge in the Middle District of Florida, also stated on the record that a filing in the case had "a stench of impropriety" Id. at Ex. 4 (Transcript of Proceedings held on March 8, 2017, In re Eagan Avenatti, LLP, No. 6:17-bk-01329-KSJ (March 8, 2017), ECF 157-1, at 22:12-13; 23:9-17.). We believe the attached court documents amplify our opposition to Mr. Avenatti's motion to be

Case 1:18-mj-03161-KMW Document 66 Filed 05/29/18 Page 2 of 2

Letter to United States District Judge Kimba Wood May 28, 2018

Page 2

admitted pro hac vice.

We have also attached a tweet published by Mr. Avenatti on May 18, shortly after we filed Mr. Cohen's brief with the Court, regarding one of the undersigned lawyers and the law firm representing Mr. Cohen. Exhibit D, Michael Avenatti, Twitter (May 18, 2018, 5:38 PM). We did not respond to the numerous media requests that resulted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stephen Ryan Stephen Ryan

/s/ Todd Harrison Todd Harrison

cc: Counsel of Record